

Remarks

Claims 1-33 are pending. The drawings are accepted.

Claim 20 was objected to for an informality that has been corrected by amendments to the claims above. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claims 1-11 and 27-31 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These were detailed on page 2 of the Office Action. All of these issues have been corrected by the amendments to the claims above. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

The specification was objected to as failing to provide a proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter in claims 27, 29 and 31. These claims have been canceled by amendment above. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 12-15, 22-28, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Williams et al (US Patent No. 6,665,750).

Claims 1, 12, 22, 28 and 32 have been amended to more clearly identify that the methods claimed in claims 1 and 12, and the devices claimed in claims 22, 28 and 32 have the detection of the interrupts occurring local to the central processor. These amendments received support in several places in the specification, among them Figures 1, 4 and 6 and their accompanying discussions. This is not shown or taught by Williams. As can be seen in Figure 1, and the text at col. 3, lines 54-57; col. 4, lines 6-12, as examples, the device performing the interrupt detection is device 18, which resides across the PCI bus 20 from the CPU 12. Having the device detecting the interrupts be local to the central processor, as claimed in amended claims 1, 12, 22, 28 and 32 is not shown nor taught by the prior art. It is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2 and 7 depend from claim 1, claims 13-15 depend from claim 12 and claims 23-26 depend from claim 22. These claims inherently contain all of the limitations of their respective base claims. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claims, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 27 and 31 have been canceled by this amendment.

Claims 8-11, 16-21, 29-30 and 33 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Swanstrom (US Patent No. 5,822,568).

Claims 8, 16, 19, 30 and 33 have been amended to more particularly point out that the detection of the interrupts occurs local to the central processor. These amendments received support in several places, among them the architectures shown in Figures 1, 4 and 6 and their accompanying discussions. Swanstrom does not teach that the interrupt detection and handling is performed local to a central processor. The direct memory access controller 750 that detects interrupt for the devices on the PCI bus 730 is not local to the central processor 710. See Swanstrom Figure 7, and the discussion at col. 8. lines 51-57; and col. 9, line 61 through col. 10, line 4. As Swanstrom does not disclose the interrupt detection and handling being performed local to the CPU, as in the amended claims, it is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 8, claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 16 and claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 19. These claims inherently contain all of the limitations of their respective base claims. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claims, much less the further embodiments of the

dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Swanstrom. As discussed above, both Williams and Swanstrom teach interrupt detection and handling at devices that are not local to the central processing unit as taught in amended claim 1, from which these claims depend. As these claims inherently contain this limitation, the combination of references does not render these claims obvious. It is therefore submitted that claims 3-6 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Conclusion

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 222-3613

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on December 9, 2005

Signature
Lauren Ballard-Gemmell
Lauren Ballard-Gemmell